

1 Stephen E. Taylor (SBN 058452)
Jonathan A. Patchen (SBN 237346)
2 TAYLOR & COMPANY LAW OFFICES, LLP
One Ferry Building, Suite 355
3 San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (415) 788-8200
4 Facsimile: (415) 788-8208
Email: staylor@tcolaw.com
5 Email: jpatchen@tcolaw.com

6 Kenneth A. Gallo (*pro hac vice to be submitted*)
Joseph J. Simons (*pro hac vice to be submitted*)
7 Craig A. Benson (*pro hac vice to be submitted*)
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP
8 2001 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1047
9 Telephone: (202) 223-7300
Facsimile: (202) 223-7420
10 Email: kgallo@paulweiss.com
Email: jsimons@paulweiss.com
11 Email: cbenson@paulweiss.com

12 *Attorneys for Sharp Electronics Corporation and*
Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of America, Inc.
13

14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
15 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
16 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

17
18 IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 07-cv-5944

MDL No. 1917

19 This Document Relates To:

20 *Sharp Electronics Corporation, Sharp Electronics*
Manufacturing Company of America, Inc. v.
21 *Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. et al.*, Case No.
22 13-cv-2776 (MEJ)

**DECLARATION OF JONATHAN A.
PATCHEN IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO CONSIDER
WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE
RELATED**

1 I, JONATHAN A. PATCHEN, hereby declare as follows:

2 1. I am a partner at Taylor & Company Law Offices LLP, counsel of record
3 for plaintiffs Sharp Electronics Corporation and Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of
4 America, Inc., and am duly licensed to practice before this Court. I am making this declaration
5 in support of Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Case Should Be Related. I
6 have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein and, if called as a witness, could and would
7 testify competently as to the matters set forth herein.

8 2. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a copy of the Complaint filed in *Sharp*
9 *Electronics Corporation and Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of America, Inc. v.*
10 *Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V., et al.*, Case No. 13-cv-2776 (the "Sharp Action").

11 3. The Sharp Action is an antitrust action filed against certain defendants
12 also named in *In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 07-cv-5944-SC
13 (MDL No. 1917). Both actions involve allegations that defendants conspired to fix the prices of
14 Cathode Ray Tubes ("CRTs") and seek the same form of relief under Section 1 of the Sherman
15 Act, Sections 4 and 16 of the Clayton Act, and the laws of California and other states.

16 4. A stipulation pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11(a) could not be obtained
17 because defendants in the Sharp Action have not yet appeared.

18 I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States of America,
19 that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 18th day of June, 2013, at San Francisco,
20 California.

21 _____
22 /s/ Jonathan A. Patchen
23 JONATHAN A. PATCHEN
24
25
26
27
28